TEMPORAL CHARACTERISTICS OF ENGLISH MODAL VERB.

Karsi State University of Economics and Pedagogy
Master's student in Faculty of
Foreign Language and Literature
Tilavova Sarvinoz

Annotation: *English modal verbs present unique challenges in temporal interpretation due to their lack of clear tense distinctions. This paper examines the key problems in assigning past, present, or future reference to modals and proposes solutions through contextual analysis, periphrastic alternatives, and aspectual modifications. Corpus-based evidence is used to support theoretical claims, offering practical insights for linguists and language learners.*

Key words*: modal verb, paradigm, relationship, semantics, can, may, will, shall, must, ought to.*

INGLIZCHA MODAL FE'LNING TEMPORAL XUSUSIYATLARI.

Qarshi iqtisodiyot va pedagogik universitituti.
Xorijiy til va adabiyot fakulteti magistranti
Tilavova Sarvinoz

Annotatsiya: *Ingliz modal fe'llari aniq zamon farqlari yo'qligi sababli vaqtinchalik talqin qilishda o'ziga xos qiyinchiliklarni keltirib chiqaradi. Ushbu maqola modallarga o'tmish, hozirgi yoki kelajakdagi havolalarni belgilashda asosiy muammolarni ko'rib chiqadi va kontekstual tahlil, perifrastik alternativalar va aspektual modifikatsiyalar orqali echimlarni taklif qiladi. Korpusga asoslangan dalillar nazariy da'volarni qo'llab-quvvatlash, tilshunoslar va til o'rganuvchilar uchun amaliy tushunchalarni taklif qilish uchun ishlatiladi.*

Kalit so‘zlar*: modal fe’l, paradigma, munosabat, semantika, can, may, will, shall, must, ought to.*

English modal verbs' distinct relationship to the time and aspect categories is determined by their uniqueness in semantics, morphology, origin, and historical development. This article's goals are to outline the primary temporal features of English modal verbs, discuss the issues they raise, and suggest potential fixes. We were able to determine the following characteristics by looking at how English modal verbs behave in relation to their temporal meaning.

1. The paradigm of modal verbs proper is inadequate, as evidenced by the lack of impersonal forms and the scarcity of tenses: a) All persons and numbers have a single present tense form; analytical forms of the future tense, if any, are impossible because the

infinitive is absent and modal verbs are mutually excluded (at least in standard English); past tense forms are only found in the verbs can, may, will, and shall; must and ought (to) do not have past tense forms, though historically they go back exactly to such: must - to the preterite form of the verb mot, ought - to the preterite form of the verb again); the modal verb need also does not have a past tense form (all tense forms, however, are found in its notional equivalent).

2. The qualifier (qualifier of a proposition as possible or necessary and expressing the meanings of obligation, permission, and ability) and emlistifier (qualifier of the truth of a proposition from the point of view of the speaker and carrying the meaning of an assumption of varying degrees of confidence) are two types of modality that are not always conveyed by the present and past tense forms of English modal verbs.

More or less consistently, the modal verbs can, may, will, and shall function as forms of the present and past tenses when conveying acuteness. As a result, the verbs could and can indicate competence in the past and present, respectively: He's literate. At five years old, he was able to read. In the present and past, the verbs can and might also express broad consent to carry out an action repeatedly:

Anytime I want, I can visit his farm.

I was welcome to visit his farm at any time last summer.

The present tense verb will conveys recurring activities, would

- in the past: He will continue to deceive his parents.

He continued to lie to his parents when he was twelve years old.

This also applies to the combination shall-should to a lesser degree because should has a lot of different meanings than shall, which makes it possible to state that should was rethought as a separate verb in the present tense. Nevertheless, should can, albeit very infrequently, function as a past tense form, for instance, to express purpose in the past:

I will have more authority over policy areas as prime minister.

I was convinced that, in my capacity as prime minister, I ought to have more authority over policy matters.

At the same time, there are several limitations on the usage of past tense forms. While they can be freely employed in indirect discourse, they are not always able to convey the same meanings about past activities that present tense forms do about current actions in independent settings. Therefore, the present tense of the verb may conveys the meaning of a root possibility based on permission (You may enter); yet, its past tense form may only be used in indirect speech contexts.

He stated that it is impossible outside of it and that I might enter when I knocked on the door. According to F. Palmer, modal verbs function as performatives in such deontic situations because the performative act takes place at the moment of speech, or in the present, and cannot be shown to have occurred in the past (apart from indirect speech). This means that the modal verb may not be able to convey the meaning of permission granted in the past. In indirect speech, might can be used to describe a deontic position of permission in the past. Additionally, the verbs might and may can be employed in direct or indirect

interrogative sentences that indicate a deontic scenario of "requesting" permission in the present (May / Might I have some coffee?).

He inquired if he might stay there for a week.

I wonder if I may or might ask you for a favor.

Modal verbs might and would be subject to quite various kinds of limitations. Could cannot be used to convey the ability to carry out a particular action in the past. * Even though it was dark, he was able to read the sign; therefore, it needs to be changed to the equivalent, be able to. Despite the darkness, he managed to read the sign. Additionally, could cannot be used to express consent to carry out a particular action in the past. He was permitted to go out last night), and it needs to be changed to the equivalent. He was permitted to go out last night. These limitations are lifted in negative statements. Because it was dark, he was unable to read the sign; he was not permitted to leave last night. Although sentences with this modal verb, which only indicates the subject's ability or possibility to perform actions in the past, do not imply their actual implementation (which would be conveyed by the sentence), the one-time and concrete nature of the actions in the situations described implies their implementation (i.e., he read the sign, he went out into the street). This is likely why using the form is impossible. He went outside after reading the sign. The employment of the forms be able to and be allowed to, which permit the actions to be regarded as completed, resolves such a contradiction. Since negative sentences imply that the acts stated did not occur, it is possible to use couldn't.

In a similar vein, the verb will conveys the meaning of "will help you" in the present, but it is only employed in indirect speech to convey the meaning of "will expression" in the past. He stated he would help me, and outside of indirect communication, I asked him and he would help me. In affirmative sentences, "I asked him and he was willing to help me," should be substituted with its counterpart, "be willing to." Both possibilities are feasible in negative statements, such as the one involving could (8e). He refused to assist me when I begged him to.

F. Palmer claims that the sentence is impossible since it suggests that the action—that is, "he helped me"—actually occurred. It is necessary to substitute the equivalent be willing to, which is not fully modal and does not have such restrictions, for modal verbs because they can only express an attitude toward an action (in this case, a desire to perform it), not the performance of the action itself (unlike the sentence He helped me).

The contrast in time between pairs of modal verbs, can-could, may-might, shall-should, and will-would, breaks down when conveying epistemic modality. First of all, unlike present tense forms, which convey an assumption in the present, past tense forms do not represent assumptions in the past. Instead, they act in an epistemic meaning in simple sentences.

It is impossible for John's wife to be wealthy = John's wife could not be wealthy = It is not feasible for John's wife to be wealthy ^ It was not possible for John's wife to be wealthy;

John may go to Italy = John might go to Italy = It is possible that John will go to Italy. It was possible that John would go to Italy;

You will know my friend = You would know my friend = It is necessary that you know my friend. It was necessary that you knew my friend.

It is possible to express that the past tense forms of the assumption are only employed in subordinate clauses where the verb of propositional (mental) relation is in the main phrase. In this instance, the way modal verbs function is comparable to how conventional verb tenses agree; the tense of the action in the main phrase and the tense of the modal qualification match:

He thought that John's wife couldn't be rich/ John might go to Italy.

Second, the present and past tenses do not always act in tandem when expressing epistemic modality. Therefore, the word should, which is connected to the future and does not accept the perfect infinitive as a complement, expresses the speaker's assurance that the action will undoubtedly occur:

If she recommends my book, I shall be very surprised.

The epistemic should is not only concerned with the future; it can also freely combine with any type of infinitive to indicate an assumption about the past and present. In contrast to its past tense form, could, the modal verb can is significantly less likely to communicate epistemic possibility. Statistics from the most recent study of how modal verbs function, which used data from British, American, and Australian corpora, show that can occurs in this sense in about 1.1% of situations and could in 14.1%. This allows for the unrestricted expression of epistemic modality in every kind of sentence: He could be hiding there.

- He couldn't be hiding there.
- Could he be hiding there?).

There are several restrictions on the epistemic use of can: it can only express epistemic possibility in negative phrases and general inquiries. There's no way he's hiding there. Is he hiding somewhere? (However, he might be hiding there). The findings of corpus research (J. Coates rules out the idea of affirmative epistemic usage of can) provide evidence for this. Only a few instances of its epistemic functioning are found by P. Collins in utterances that he views as straddling the line between epistemic and dynamic (a kind of root) modality.

REFERENCES:

1. Palmer, F. R. (2001). Mood and Modality. Cambridge University Press.

2. Huddleston, R., & Pullum, G. K. (2002). The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language.

3. Biber, D., et al. (1999). Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English.